



**CALFED
BAY-DELTA
PROGRAM**

1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155
Sacramento, California 95814

(916) 657-2666
FAX (916) 654-9780

M e m o r a n d u m

Date: July 10, 1997

To: BDAC Members

From: Sharon Gross
CALFED Bay-Delta Program

Subject: Decision Process for Selecting the Draft Preferred Alternative

Attached are descriptions of the two step process being used to refine the Phase II alternatives and select the draft preferred alternative, and an example which demonstrates application of Step 1, "Alternatives Narrowing". The papers are entitled:

- "The Decision Process to Draft Preferred Alternative", and
- "Alternative Narrowing Process -- Example -- Alternative 3C".

As the Program proceeds through Step 1, we are refining the process from that described at the May 22 BDAC meeting. We are looking primarily at engineering/technical feasibility and costs and are applying, on a general basis, the "implementability" solution principle. We are finding that it is better to apply the principles at the end of "Detailed Evaluation" (Step 2) when making tradeoffs between policy issues.

In May we laid out three steps for selecting the preferred alternative. We have now collapsed steps 2 and 3 into a single step, but still expect to rank and narrow alternatives using the Program objectives, solution principles, and information from the concurrent processes, as explained in May.

Step 1 -- Alternatives Narrowing

The CALFED agencies are in the middle of Step 1, which is expected to be completed by August 1997. At the July 22 meeting BDAC will be briefed on preliminary results of Step 1. The objective of this step is to reduce the number of alternatives to a more manageable number for Step 2, while ensuring they still meet the Program objectives and solution principles. Given this objective we pose the following question to help frame discussion.

CALFED Agencies

California

The Resources Agency
Department of Fish and Game
Department of Water Resources
California Environmental Protection Agency
State Water Resources Control Board

Federal

Environmental Protection Agency
Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation
Department of Commerce
National Marine Fisheries Service

July 10, 1997

Page 2

- Are the results of the narrowing, as presented at the meeting, reasonable, given the process and criteria presented in the attached description? If not, what suggestions do you have to improve the process and criteria?

Step 2 -- Detailed Evaluation

CALFED Agencies will conduct Step 2 from August to November 1997. To proceed into Step 2 the Program needs advice from BDAC that the distinguishing characteristics listed in the first paper is complete and their application will provide the needed information for comparing alternatives.

When reviewing the description of the Step 2 process, please consider the following questions when preparing for the meeting.

- Do the proposed distinguishing characteristics and criteria appear adequate to compare the Phase II Alternatives at the programmatic level? If not, what distinguishing characteristics and criteria should be added or changed?
- As stated in the first paper, tradeoffs and balancing will occur when alternatives are compared to the solution principles, at the end of detailed evaluation. What kinds of tradeoffs might result when changing the alternatives to balance the objectives and needs of stakeholders?

Next Steps

Following the July 22 BDAC meeting, CALFED agencies will proceed through Step 2. During that time, discussions on issues that need to be resolved prior to release of the draft programmatic EIR/EIS will continue in public and outside discussions. BDAC will be presented with the final results of Step 1 and progress made during Step 2. BDAC will be asked to contribute to the dialogues at its September meeting.